ON MIXED JOINT DISCRETE UNIVERSALITY FOR A CLASS OF ZETA-FUNCTIONS

ROMA KAČINSKAITĖ AND KOHJI MATSUMOTO

arXiv:1611.08126v1 [math.NT] 24 Nov 2016

ABSTRACT. We prove a mixed joint discrete universality theorem for a Matsumoto zeta-function $\varphi(s)$ (belonging to the Steuding subclass) and a periodic Hurwitz zeta-function $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$. For this purpose, certain independence condition for the parameter α and the minimal step of discrete shifts of these functions is assumed. This paper is a continuation of authors' works [12] and [13].

Keywords: discrete shift, joint approximation, linear independence, periodic Hurwitz zeta-function, Matsumoto zeta-function, universality.

AMS classification: 11M06, 11M41, 11M36.

1. INTRODUCTION

In analytic number theory, the problem of so-called mixed joint universality in Voronin's sense is a very interesting problem since it solves a problem on simultaneous approximation of certain tuples of analytic functions by shifts of tuples consisting of zeta-functions having an Euler product expansion over the set of primes and other zeta-functions without such product. For such type of universality, a very important role is played by the parameters which occur in the definitions of zeta-functions.

The first result on mixed joint universality was obtained by H. Mishou in [21]. He proved that the Riemann zeta-function $\zeta(s)$ and the Hurwitz zeta-function $\zeta(s,\alpha)$ with transcendental parameter α are jointly universal.

Let $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ be the sets of all primes, positive integers, non-negative integers, integers, rational numbers, real numbers and complex numbers, respectively. Denote by $s=\sigma+it$ a complex variable. Recall that the functions $\zeta(s)$ and $\zeta(s,\alpha)$, $0<\alpha\le 1$, for $\sigma>1$, are defined by

$$\zeta(s)=\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{m^s}=\prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}}\left(1-\frac{1}{p^s}\right)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta(s,\alpha)=\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(m+\alpha)^s},$$

respectively. Both of them are analytically continued to the whole complex plane, except for a simple pole at the point $s=1$ with residue 1. Note that the Riemann zeta-function has the Euler product expansion, while in general the Hurwitz zeta-function does not have (except the cases $\alpha=\frac{1}{2}, 1$).

For Mishou's result and further statements, we introduce some notations. Let $D(a,b)=\{s\in\mathbb{C}: a<\sigma<b\}$ for any $a<b$. For every compact set $K\subset\mathbb{C}$, denote by $H^c(K)$ the

set of all $\mathbb{C}$-valued continuous functions defined on K and holomorphic in the interior of K. By $H_0^c(K)$ we denote the subset of $H^c(K)$, consisting of all elements which are non-vanishing on K.

Theorem 1 ([21]). *Suppose that α is a transcendental number. Let K_1 and K_2 be compact subsets of the strip $D(\frac{1}{2},1)$ with connected complements. Suppose that $f_1(s)\in H_0^c(K_1)$ and $f_2(s)\in H^c(K_2)$. Then, for every $\varepsilon>0$,*

$$\liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\mathrm{meas}\left\{\tau\in[0,T]:\sup_{s\in K_1}|\zeta(s+i\tau)-f_1(s)|<\varepsilon,\sup_{s\in K_2}|\zeta(s+i\tau,\alpha)-f_2(s)|<\varepsilon\right\}>0.$$

Here, as usual, $\mathrm{meas}\{A\}$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of the measurable set $A\subset\mathbb{R}$.

Note that J. Sander and J. Steuding [23] proved the same type of universality, but for rational α, by a quite different method.

In [12], we consider the mixed joint universality property for a wide class of zeta-functions consisting of Matsumoto zeta-functions $\varphi(s)$ belonging to the Steuding class $\widetilde{S}$ and periodic Hurwitz zeta-functions $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$.

Recall the definition of the polynomial Euler products $\widetilde{\varphi}(s)$ or so-called Matsumoto zeta-functions. (Remark: The function $\widetilde{\varphi}(s)$ was introduced by the second author in [18].) For $m\in\mathbb{N}$, let $g(m)$ be a positive integer and p_m the mth prime number. Moreover, let $a_m^{(j)}\in\mathbb{C}$, and $f(j,m)\in\mathbb{N}$, $1\le j\le g(m)$. The function $\widetilde{\varphi}(s)$ is defined by the polynomial Euler product

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(s)=\prod_{m=1}^{\infty}\prod_{j=1}^{g(m)}\left(1-a_m^{(j)}p_m^{-sf(j,m)}\right)^{-1}. \tag{1}$$

It is assumed that

$$g(m)\le C_1p_m^{\alpha}\quad\text{and}\quad|a_m^{(j)}|\le p_m^{\beta} \tag{2}$$

with a positive constant C_1 and non-negative constants α and β. In view of (2), the function $\widetilde{\varphi}(s)$ converges absolutely for $\sigma>\alpha+\beta+1$, and hence, in this region, it can be given by the absolutely convergent Dirichlet series

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(s)=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\widetilde{c}_k}{k^s}. \tag{3}$$

The shifted function $\varphi(s)$ is given by

$$\varphi(s)=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\widetilde{c}_k}{k^{s+\alpha+\beta}}=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{c_k}{k^s} \tag{4}$$

with $c_k=k^{-\alpha-\beta}\widetilde{c}_k$. For $\sigma>1$, the last series in (4) converges absolutely too.

Also, suppose that, for the function $\varphi(s)$, the following assumptions hold (for the details, see [18]):

(a) $\varphi(s)$ can be continued meromorphically to $\sigma\ge\sigma_0$, where $\frac{1}{2}\le\sigma_0<1$, and all poles in this region are included in a compact set which has no intersection with the line $\sigma=\sigma_0$,

(b) $\varphi(\sigma+it)=O(|t|^{C_2})$ for $\sigma\geq\sigma_0$, where C_2 is a positive constant,

(c) the mean-value estimate

$$\int_0^T|\varphi(\sigma_0+it)|^2dt=O(T). \tag{5}$$

It is possible to discuss functional limit theorems for Matsumoto zeta-functions (see Section 2 below), but this framework is too wide to consider the universality property. To investigate the universality, we introduce the Steuding subclass $\widetilde{S}$, for which the following slightly more restrictive conditions are required. We say that the function $\varphi(s)$ belongs to the class $\widetilde{S}$, if the following conditions are fulfilled:

(i) there exists a Dirichlet series expansion

$$\varphi(s)=\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{a(m)}{m^s}$$

with $a(m)=O(m^{\varepsilon})$ for every $\varepsilon>0$;

(ii) there exists $\sigma_\varphi<1$ such that $\varphi(s)$ can be meromorphically continued to the half-plane $\sigma>\sigma_\varphi$, and holomorphic except for at most a pole at $s=1$;

(iii) there exists a constant $c\geq 0$ such that

$$\varphi(\sigma+it)=O(|t|^{c+\varepsilon})$$

for every fixed $\sigma>\sigma_\varphi$ and $\varepsilon>0$;

(iv) there exists the Euler product expansion over prime numbers, i.e.,

$$\varphi(s)=\prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}}\prod_{j=1}^{l}\left(1-\frac{a_j(p)}{p^s}\right)^{-1};$$

(v) there exists a constant $\kappa>0$ such that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{1}{\pi(x)}\sum_{p\leq x}|a(p)|^2=\kappa,$$

where $\pi(x)$ denotes the number of primes up to x, i.e., $p\leq x$.

For $\varphi\in\widetilde{S}$, let σ^* be the infimum of all σ_1 for which

$$\frac{1}{2T}\int_{-T}^{T}|\varphi(\sigma+it)|^2dt\sim\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{|a(m)|^2}{m^{2\sigma}}$$

holds for every $\sigma\geq\sigma_1$. Then it is known that $\frac{1}{2}\leq\sigma^*<1$. (Remark: The class $\widetilde{S}$ was introduced by J. Steuding in [24].)

Now we recall the definition of the periodic Hurwitz zeta-function $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$ with a fixed parameter α, $0<\alpha\leq 1$. (Remark: The function $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$ was introduced by A. Javtokas and A. Laurinčikas in [8].) Let $\mathfrak{B}=\{b_m:m\in\mathbb{N}_0\}$ be a periodic sequence

of complex numbers (not all zero) with minimal period $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For $\sigma > 1$, the function $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$ is defined by

$$\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{b_m}{(m+\alpha)^s}.$$

It is known that

$$\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}) = \frac{1}{k^s} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} b_l \zeta\left(s, \frac{l+\alpha}{k}\right), \quad \sigma > 1. \tag{6}$$

The last equality gives an analytic continuation of the function $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$ to the whole complex plane, except for a possible simple pole at the point $s = 1$ with residue

$$b := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} b_l.$$

If $b = 0$, then $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$ is an entire function.

In [12], we prove the mixed joint universality property of the functions $\varphi(s)$ and $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$.

Theorem 2 ([12]). *Suppose that $\varphi(s) \in \widetilde{S}$, and α is a transcendental number. Let K_1 be a compact subset of $D(\sigma^*,1)$, and K_2 be a compact subset of $D(\frac{1}{2},1)$, both with connected complements. Suppose that $f_1 \in H_0^c(K_1)$ and $f_2 \in H^c(K_2)$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \operatorname{meas}\left\{ \tau \in [0,T] : \sup_{s\in K_1} |\varphi(s+i\tau) - f_1(s)| < \varepsilon, \right.$$
$$\left. \sup_{s\in K_2} |\zeta(s+i\tau,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}) - f_2(s)| < \varepsilon \right\} > 0.$$

In [13], we obtain a generalization of Theorem 2, in which several periodic Hurwitz zeta-functions are involved.

More interesting and convenient in practical applications is so-called discrete universality of zeta-functions (for example, see [2]). This pushes us to extend our investigations of mixed joint universality for a class of zeta-functions to the discrete case. Recall that, in this case, the pair of analytic functions is approximated by discrete shifts of tuple $\big(\varphi(s+ikh), \zeta(s+ikh,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})\big)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where $h > 0$ is the minimal step of given arithmetical progression.

The aim of this paper is to prove a mixed joint discrete universality theorem for the collection of the functions $(\varphi(s), \zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}))$, i.e., the discrete version of Theorem 2.

For $h > 0$, let

$$L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h) = \left\{ (\log p : p \in \mathbb{P}), (\log(m+\alpha) : m \in \mathbb{N}_0), \frac{2\pi}{h} \right\}.$$

Theorem 3. *Let $\varphi(s) \in \widetilde{S}$, K_1, K_2, $f_1(s)$ and $f_2(s)$ satisfy the conditions as in Theorem 2. Suppose that the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N+1} \#\left\{ 0 \le k \le N : \quad \sup_{s\in K_1} |\varphi(s+ikh) - f_1(s)| < \varepsilon, \right.$$
$$\left. \sup_{s\in K_2} |\zeta(s+ikh,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}) - f_2(s)| < \varepsilon \right\} > 0.$$

Remark 1. A typical situation when $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ is linearly independent is the case when α and $\exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\}$ are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. The proof of this fact is given in [3].

Now recall some known facts of discrete universality which directly connect with objects under our interests.

Discrete universality property for the Matsumoto zeta-function under the condition that $\exp\{\frac{2\pi k}{h}\}$ is irrational for every non-zero integer k was obtained by the first author in [9]. While the discrete universality of the periodic Hurwitz zeta-functions was proved by A. Laurinčikas and R. Macaitienė in [17].

Also, some results on discrete analogue of mixed universality are known. The first attempt in this direction was done by the first author in [10], under the assumption that α is transcendental and $\exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\}$ is rational. Unfortunately the proof in [10] is incomplete, as mentioned by A. Laurinčikas in 2014 (see [4]). However the argument in [10] gives a correct proof for the modified L-functions where all Euler factors corresponding to primes in the set of all prime numbers appearing as a prime factor of a or b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\} \in \mathbb{Q}$, $a,b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a,b) = 1$, are removed; see Section 5.

In [3] and [4], E. Buivydas and A. Laurinčikas proved the joint mixed discrete universality for the Riemann zeta-function $\zeta(s)$ and Hurwitz zeta-function $\zeta(s,\alpha)$. The first result [3] deals with the case when the minimal steps of arithmetical progressions h for both functions are common, while in the second paper [4], for $\zeta(s)$ and $\zeta(s,\alpha)$, the minimal steps h_1 and h_2 are different from each other.

It is the purpose of the present paper to give the proof of the joint mixed discrete universality theorem (Theorem 3) for $(\varphi(s),\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}))$, which generalizes the result from [3], and to clarify the situation in [10].

2. A JOINT MIXED DISCRETE LIMIT THEOREM

The proof of Theorem 3 is based on a joint mixed discrete limit theorem in the sense of weakly convergent probability measures in the space of analytic functions for the Matsumoto zeta-functions $\varphi(s)$ and the periodic Hurwitz zeta-function $\zeta(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})$ (for the detailed expositions of this method, see [15], [24]), which we prove in this section, using the linear independence of the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$. In this section, $\varphi(s)$ denotes any general Matsumoto zeta-function.

For further statements, we start with some notations and definitions.

For a set S, denote by $\mathcal{B}(S)$ the set of all Borel subset of S. Let $\gamma = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |s| = 1\}$. Define

$$\Omega_1 = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \gamma_p \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_2 = \prod_{m=0}^{\infty} \gamma_m,$$

where $\gamma_p = \gamma$ for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, and $\gamma_m = \gamma$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By the Tikhonov theorem (see [14]), the tori Ω_1 and Ω_2 with the product topology and the pointwise multiplication are compact topological groups. Then

$$\Omega := \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$$

is a compact topological Abelian group too, and we obtain the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), m_H)$. Here $m_H = m_{1H} \times m_{2H}$ with the probability Haar measures m_{1H} and m_{2H} defined on the spaces $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_1))$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_2))$, respectively.

Let $\omega_1(p)$ stand for the projection of $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ to the coordinate space γ_p, $p \in \mathbb{P}$, and, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we put

$$\omega_1(m) = \prod_{j=1}^{r} \omega_1(p_j)^{l_j},$$

where, by factorizing of m into the primes, $m = p_1^{l_1} \cdots p_r^{l_r}$. Let $\omega_2(m)$ denotes the projection of $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$ to the coordinate space γ_m, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Define $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for elements of Ω. For any open subregion G in the complex plane, let $H(G)$ be the space of analytic functions on G equipped with the topology of uniform convergence in compacta.

The function $\varphi(s)$ has only finitely many poles by the condition (a). Denote those poles by $s_1(\varphi), \dots, s_l(\varphi)$, and define

$$D_\varphi = \{s : \ \sigma > \sigma_0, \ \sigma \neq \Re s_j(\varphi), \ 1 \le j \le l\}.$$

Then $\varphi(s)$ and its vertical shift $\varphi(s+ikh)$ are holomorphic in D_φ. The function $\zeta(s, \alpha; \mathfrak{B})$ can be written as a linear combination of Hurwitz zeta-functions (6), therefore it is entire, or has a simple pole at $s = 1$. Therefore $\zeta(s, \alpha; \mathfrak{B})$ and its vertical shift $\zeta(s + ikh, \alpha; \mathfrak{B})$ are holomorphic in

$$D_\zeta = \begin{cases} \left\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \ \sigma > \frac{1}{2}\right\} & \text{if} \quad \zeta(s, \alpha; \mathfrak{B}) \ \text{ is entire,} \\ \left\{s : \ \sigma > \frac{1}{2}, \sigma \neq 1\right\} & \text{if} \quad s = 1 \ \text{ is a pole of } \ \zeta(s, \alpha; \mathfrak{B}). \end{cases}$$

Now, in view of the definitions of D_φ and D_ζ, let D_1 and D_2 be two open subsets of D_φ and D_ζ, respectively. Let $\underline{H} = H(D_1) \times H(D_2)$. On $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), m_H)$, define the $\underline{H}$-valued random element $\underline{Z}(\underline{s}, \omega)$ by the formula

$$\underline{Z}(\underline{s}, \omega) = \big(\varphi(s_1, \omega_1), \zeta(s_2, \alpha, \omega_2; \mathfrak{B})\big),$$

where $\underline{s} = (s_1, s_2) \in D_1 \times D_2$,

$$\varphi(s_1, \omega_1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_k \omega_1(k)}{k^{s_1}} \tag{7}$$

and

$$\zeta(s_2,\alpha,\omega_2;\mathfrak{B})=\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{b_m\omega_2(m)}{(m+\alpha)^{s_2}},\tag{8}$$

respectively.

Denote by $P_{\underline{Z}}$ the distribution of $\underline{Z}(\underline{s},\omega)$ as an $\underline{H}$-valued random element, i.e.,

$$P_{\underline{Z}}(A)=m_H\{\omega\in\Omega:\ \underline{Z}(\underline{s},\omega)\in A\},\quad A\in\mathcal{B}(\underline{H}).$$

Let $N>0$. Define the probability measure P_N on $\underline{H}$ by the formula

$$P_N(A)=\frac{1}{N+1}\#\big\{0\le k\le N:\ \underline{Z}(\underline{s}+ikh)\in A\big\},\quad A\in\mathcal{B}(\underline{H}),$$

where $\underline{s}+ikh=(s_1+ikh,s_2+ikh)$ with $s_1\in D_1$, $s_2\in D_2$, and

$$\underline{Z}(\underline{s})=(\varphi(s_1),\zeta(s_2,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})).$$

In the course of the proof of Theorem 3, the first main goal is the following mixed joint discrete limit theorem.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then the probability measure P_N converges weakly to $P_{\underline{Z}}$ as $N\to\infty$.*

We will omit some details of the proof, because the proof follows in the standard way (see, for example, the proof of Theorem 7 of [3]). However, though the following lemma, a mixed joint discrete limit theorem on the torus Ω, is exactly the same as Lemma 1 of [3], we reproduce the detailed proof, since this result plays a crucial role, and from the proof we can see why the linear independence of $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ is necessary.

Define

$$Q_N(A):=\frac{1}{N+1}\#\left\{0\le k\le N:\big(\big(p^{-ikh}:p\in\mathbb{P}\big),\big((m+\alpha)^{-ikh}:m\in\mathbb{N}_0\big)\big)\in A\right\},\quad A\in\mathcal{B}(\Omega).$$

Lemma 5 ([3])**.** *Suppose that the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ satisfies the condition of Theorem 3. Then Q_N converges weakly to the Haar measure m_H as $N\to\infty$.*

Proof. For the proof of Lemma 5, we use the Fourier transformation method (for the details, see [15]). The dual group of Ω is isomorphic to the group

$$G:=\left(\bigoplus_{p\in\mathbb{P}}\mathbb{Z}_p\right)\bigoplus\left(\bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}\mathbb{Z}_m\right)$$

with $\mathbb{Z}_p=\mathbb{Z}$ for all $p\in\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_m=\mathbb{Z}$ for all $m\in\mathbb{N}_0$. The element of G is written as $(\underline{k},\underline{l})=((k_p:p\in\mathbb{P}),(l_m:m\in\mathbb{N}_0))$, where only finite number of integers k_p and l_m are non-zero, and acts on Ω by

$$(\omega_1,\omega_2)\to(\omega_1^{\underline{k}},\omega_2^{\underline{l}})=\prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}}\omega_1^{k_p}(p)\prod_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}\omega_2^{l_m}(m).$$

Let $g_N(\underline{k},\underline{l})$, for $(\underline{k},\underline{l}) \in G$, be the Fourier transform of the measure $Q_N(A)$. Then we have

$$g_N(\underline{k},\underline{l}) = \int_\Omega \left(\prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}} \omega_1^{k_p}(p) \prod_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} \omega_2^{l_m}(m) \right) \mathrm{d}Q_N.$$

Thus, from the definition of $Q_N(A)$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_N(\underline{k},\underline{l}) &= \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{k=0}^{N} \prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}} p^{-ikk_p h} \prod_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} (m+\alpha)^{-ikl_m h} \\ &= \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{k=0}^{N} \exp\left\{ -ikh \left(\sum_{p\in\mathbb{P}} k_p \log p + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} l_m \log(m+\alpha) \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

By the assumption of the lemma, the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then the set $\{(\log p : p\in\mathbb{P}), (\log(m+\alpha) : m\in\mathbb{N}_0)\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and

$$\sum_{p\in\mathbb{P}} k_p \log p + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} l_m \log(m+\alpha) = 0$$

if and only if $\underline{k} = \underline{0}$ and $\underline{l} = \underline{0}$. Moreover, if $(\underline{k},\underline{l}) \neq (\underline{0},\underline{0})$,

$$\exp\left\{ -ih \left(\sum_{p\in\mathbb{P}} k_p \log p + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} l_m \log(m+\alpha) \right) \right\} \neq 1. \tag{10}$$

In fact, if (10) is false, then

$$\sum_{p\in\mathbb{P}} k_p \log p + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} l_m \log(m+\alpha) = \frac{2\pi a}{h} \tag{11}$$

with some $a \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}$. But this contradicts to the linear independence of the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$. Therefore, from (9) and (10), we find that

$$g_N(\underline{k},\underline{l}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad (\underline{k},\underline{l}) = (\underline{0},\underline{0}), \\ \dfrac{1-\exp\left\{-i(N+1)h\left(\sum_{p\in\mathbb{P}} k_p \log p + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} l_m \log(m+\alpha)\right)\right\}}{(N+1)\left(1-\exp\left\{-ih\left(\sum_{p\in\mathbb{P}} k_p \log p + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} l_m \log(m+\alpha)\right)\right\}\right)}, & \text{if} \quad (\underline{k},\underline{l}) \neq (\underline{0},\underline{0}). \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} g_N(\underline{k},\underline{l}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad (\underline{k},\underline{l}) = (\underline{0},\underline{0}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By a continuity theorem for probability measures on compact groups (see [7]), we obtain the statement of the lemma, i.e., that $Q_N(A)$ converges weakly to m_H as $N \to \infty$. □

Now, using Lemma 5, we may prove a joint mixed discrete limit theorem for absolutely convergent Dirichlet series.

Let, for fixed $\widehat{\sigma} > \frac{1}{2}$,

$$v_1(m,n) = \exp\left\{ -\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{\widehat{\sigma}} \right\}, \quad m,n\in\mathbb{N},$$

and

$$v_2(m,n,\alpha)=\exp\left\{-\left(\frac{m+\alpha}{n+\alpha}\right)^{\widehat{\sigma}}\right\},\quad m\in\mathbb{N}_0,\quad n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Define the series

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_n(s) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{c_m v_1(m,n)}{m^s},\\ \zeta_n(s,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{b_m v_2(m,n,\alpha)}{(m+\alpha)^s},\end{aligned}$$

and, for $\widehat{\omega}:=\left(\widehat{\omega}_1,\widehat{\omega}_2\right)\in\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_n(s,\widehat{\omega}_1) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{\widehat{\omega}_1(m)c_m v_1(m,n)}{m^s},\\ \zeta_n(s,\alpha,\widehat{\omega}_2;\mathfrak{B}) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{\widehat{\omega}_2(m)b_m v_2(m,n,\alpha)}{(m+\alpha)^s},\end{aligned}$$

respectively. These series are absolutely convergent for $\sigma>\frac{1}{2}$.

For brevity, denote

$$\underline{Z}_n(\underline{s})=(\varphi_n(s_1),\zeta_n(s_2,\alpha;\mathfrak{B}))$$

and

$$\underline{Z}_n(\underline{s},\widehat{\omega})=(\varphi_n(s_1,\widehat{\omega}_1),\zeta_n(s_2,\alpha,\widehat{\omega}_2;\mathfrak{B})).$$

Now, on the space $(\underline{H},\mathcal{B}(\underline{H}))$, we consider the weak convergence of the measures

$$P_{N,n}(A)=\frac{1}{N+1}\#\left\{0\le k\le N:\underline{Z}_n(\underline{s}+ikh)\in A\right\},$$

and, for $\widehat{\omega}\in\Omega$,

$$\widehat{P}_{N,n}(A)=\frac{1}{N+1}\#\left\{0\le k\le N:\underline{Z}_n(\underline{s}+ikh,\widehat{\omega})\in A\right\}.$$

Lemma 6. *Suppose that the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then, on $(\underline{H},\mathcal{B}(\underline{H}))$, there exists a probability measure P_n such that the measures $P_{N,n}$ and $\widehat{P}_{N,n}$ both converge weakly to P_n as $N\to\infty$.*

Proof. The proof of the lemma follows analogous to Lemma 2 from [3]. □

The next step of the proof is to approximate the tuple $(\underline{Z}(\underline{s}),\underline{Z}(\underline{s},\widehat{\omega}))$ by the tuple $\left(\underline{Z}_n(\underline{s}),\underline{Z}_n(\underline{s},\widehat{\omega})\right)$. For this purpose, we will use the metric on the space $\underline{H}$. For any open region G, it is known (see [5] or [15]) that there exists a sequence of compact sets $\{K_l:l\in\mathbb{N}\}\subset G$ satisfying conditions:

(1) $G=\bigcup\limits_{l=1}^{\infty}K_l$,
(2) $K_l\subset K_{l+1}$ for any $l\in\mathbb{N}$,
(3) if K is a compact set, then $K\subset K_l$ for some $l\in\mathbb{N}$.

For functions $g_1, g_2 \in H(G)$, define a metric ρ_G by the formula

$$\rho_G(g_1,g_2) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} \frac{\sup_{s\in K_l} |g_1(s)-g_2(s)|}{1+\sup_{s\in K_l} |g_1(s)-g_2(s)|}$$

which induces the topology of uniform convergence on compacta. Put $\rho_1 = \rho_{D_1}$ and $\rho_2 = \rho_{D_2}$. Define, for $\underline{g}_1 = (g_{11}, g_{21})$ and $\underline{g}_2 = (g_{12}, g_{22})$ from $\underline{H}$,

$$\underline{\rho}(\underline{g}_1, \underline{g}_2) = \max\left\{\rho_1(g_{11}, g_{12}), \rho_2(g_{21}, g_{22})\right\}.$$

In such a way, we obtain a metric on the space $\underline{H}$ including its topology.

Lemma 7. *Suppose that the set $L(\mathbb{P}, \alpha, h)$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. The equalities*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{k=0}^{N} \underline{\rho}\big(\underline{Z}(\underline{s}+ikh), \underline{Z}_n(\underline{s}+ikh)\big) = 0 \tag{12}$$

and, for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{k=0}^{N} \underline{\rho}\big(\underline{Z}(\underline{s}+ikh, \omega), \underline{Z}_n(\underline{s}+ikh, \omega)\big) = 0 \tag{13}$$

hold.

Proof. This can be shown in a way similar to the proofs of Lemmas 3 and 4 of [3], respectively. The main body of the argument in [3], based on an application of Gallagher's lemma, is going back to the proof of Theorem 4.1 of [17]. We just indicate some different points from the proof in [3] and [17].

The starting point of the proof of (12) is the integral expression

$$\varphi_n(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{a-i\infty}^{a+i\infty} \varphi(s+z) l_n(z) \frac{dz}{z} \tag{14}$$

and

$$\zeta_n(s, \alpha; \mathfrak{B}) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{a-i\infty}^{a+i\infty} \zeta(s+z, \alpha; \mathfrak{B}) l_n(z, \alpha) \frac{dz}{z}, \tag{15}$$

where $a > \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$l_n(z) = \frac{z}{a}\Gamma\left(\frac{z}{a}\right) n^z \quad \text{and} \quad l_n(z,\alpha) = \frac{z}{a}\Gamma\left(\frac{z}{a}\right)(n+\alpha)^z,$$

respectively. We shift the paths to the left and apply the residue calculus. The case (15) is discussed in [17], where the path is moved to $\Re z = b - \sigma$ with $\frac{1}{2} < b < 1$ and $\sigma > b$. In this case, the relevant poles are only $z = 0$ and $z = 1 - s$. As for (14), we shift the path to $\Re z = \sigma_0 + \delta_0 - \sigma$, where δ_0 is a small positive number such that $\varphi(s)$ is holomorphic in the strip $\sigma_0 \le \Re s \le \sigma_0 + \delta_0$. We encounter all the poles $z = s_j(\varphi) - s$, $1 \le j \le l$, so we have to consider all the residues coming from those poles. But they can be handled by the same method as described in the proof of Theorem 4.1 of [17].

To complete the proof of (12), it is also necessary to show the discrete mean square estimate

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N} |\varphi(\sigma_0+\delta_0+it+ikh)|^2 \ll N(1+|t|). \tag{16}$$

This is an analogue of Lemma 4.3 of [17], and can be obtained similarly from (5) and Gallagher's lemma (Lemma 1.4 of [22]).

As for the proof of (13), we need the "random" version of (5), that is

$$\int_0^T |\varphi(\sigma+it,\omega_1)|^2 dt = O(T), \quad \sigma>\sigma_0, \tag{17}$$

for almost all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$. This is actually a special case of Lemma 10 of [16]. The corresponding mean value result for $\zeta(s,\alpha,\omega_2;\mathfrak{B})$ has been shown in [8]. Using those mean value results, we can show (13) in the same way as the proof of Lemma 4 of [3]. □

Lemma 7 together with the weak convergence of of the measures $P_{N,n}$ and $\widehat{P}_{N,n}$ (Lemma 6) enables us to prove that the probability measure P_N and one more probability measure defined as

$$\widehat{P}_N(A) = \frac{1}{N+1}\#\big\{0\le k\le N : \underline{Z}(\underline{s}+ikh,\omega)\in A\big\}, \quad A\in\mathcal{B}(\underline{H}),$$

both converge weakly to the same probability measure P, i.e., the following satement holds.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that the set $L(\mathbb{P},\alpha,h)$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then, on $(\underline{H},\mathcal{B}(\underline{H}))$, there exists a probability measure P such that the measures P_N and $\widehat{P}_N$ both converge weakly to P as $N\to\infty$.*

Proof. This lemma can be shown analogously to Lemma 5 from [3]. □

Proof of Theorem 4. As usual, in the last step of the proof of the functional discrete limit theorem, we show that the limit measure P in Lemma 8 coincides with $P_{\underline{Z}}$.

Define the measurable measure-preserving transformation $\Phi_h : \Omega\to\Omega$ on the group Ω by $\Phi_h(\omega) = f_h\omega$, $\omega\in\Omega$, where $f_h = \{(p^{-ih} : p\in\mathbb{P}), ((m+\alpha)^{-ih} : m\in\mathbb{N}_0)\}$. Again using (10), we see that $\{\Phi_h(s)\}$ is a one-parameter group, and is ergodic. This together with the well-known Birkhoff-Khintchine theorem (see [6]) and the weak convergence of $\widehat{P}_N(A)$ gives that $P(A) = P_{\underline{Z}}(A)$ for all $A\in\mathcal{B}(\underline{H})$. For the details, consult the proof of Theorem 7 of [3] or Theorem 6.1 of [17]. □

3. The support of the measure $P_{\underline{Z}}$

To introduce the support of $P_{\underline{Z}}$, we repeat the arguments of Section 4 from [12].

Let $\varphi\in\widetilde{S}$, and K_1, K_2, f_1 and f_2 be as in the statement of Theorem 3. Then we can find a real number σ_0 with $\sigma^*<\sigma_0<1$ and a positive number $M>0$, such that K_1 is included

in the open rectangle

$$D_M = \{s : \ \sigma_0 < \sigma < 1, \ |t| < M\}.$$

Since $\varphi(s) \in \widetilde{S}$, the pole of φ is at most at $s = 1$, then, in this case, we find that

$$D_\varphi = \{s : \ \sigma > \sigma_0, \ \sigma \neq 1\}.$$

Therefore D_M is an open subset of D_φ. Also we can find $T > 0$ such that K_2 belongs to the open rectangle

$$D_T = \left\{s : \ \frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1, \ |t| < T\right\}.$$

To obtain the support of the measure $P_{\underline{Z}}$ we will use Theorem 4 with $D_1 = D_M$ and $D_2 = D_T$. Let S_φ be the set of all $f \in H(D_M)$ which is non-vanishing on D_M, or constantly equivalent to 0 on D_M.

Theorem 9. *Suppose that the set $L(\mathbb{P}, \alpha, h)$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. The support of the measure $P_{\underline{Z}}$ is the set $S = S_\varphi \times H(D_T)$.*

Proof. This is an analogue to Lemma 4.3 of [12] or Theorem 8 from [3]. The fact that $\varphi \in \widetilde{S}$ is essentially used here. □

4. Proof of the mixed joint discrete universality theorem

The proof of Theorem 3 follows from Theorems 4 and 9 and the Mergelyan theorem (see [20]) which we state as a lemma.

Lemma 10 (Mergelyan)**.** *Let $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a compact subset with connected complement, and $f(s)$ be a continuous function on K which is analytic in the interior of K. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a polynomial $p(s)$ such that*

$$\sup_{s \in K} |f(s) - p(s)| < \varepsilon.$$

Proof of Theorem 3. By Lemma 10, there exist polynomials $p_1(s)$ and $p_2(s)$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in K_1} \left| f_1(s) - e^{p_1(s)} \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \tag{18}$$

and

$$\sup_{s \in K_2} \left| f_2(s) - p_2(s) \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{19}$$

We introduce the set

$$G = \left\{(g_1, g_2) \in \underline{H} : \sup_{s \in K_1} |g_1(s) - e^{p_1(s)}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \sup_{s \in K_2} |g_2(s) - p_2(s)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right\}.$$

Then G is an open set of the space $\underline{H}$. In virtue of Theorem 9, it is an open neighbourhood of the element $(e^{p_1(s)}, p_2(s))$ of the support of $P_{\underline{Z}}$. Thus $P_{\underline{Z}}(G) > 0$. Using Theorem 4

and an equivalent statement of the weak convergence in terms of open sets (see [1]), we obtain

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} P_N(G) \geq P_{\underline{Z}}(G) > 0.$$

This and the definitions of P_N and G show that

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N+1}\#\left\{0\leq k\leq N: \quad \sup_{s\in K_1}\left|\varphi(s+ikh)-e^{p_1(s)}\right|<\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\right.$$
$$\left.\sup_{s\in K_2}\left|\zeta(s+ikh,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})-p_2(s)\right|<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right\}>0. \quad (20)$$

From (18) and (19), we deduce that

$$\left\{0\leq k\leq N: \sup_{s\in K_1}\left|\varphi(s+ikh)-f_1(s)\right|<\varepsilon, \sup_{s\in K_2}\left|\zeta(s+ikh,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})-f_2(s)\right|<\varepsilon\right\}$$
$$\supset\left\{0\leq k\leq N: \sup_{s\in K_1}\left|\varphi(s+ikh)-e^{p_1(s)}\right|<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \sup_{s\in K_2}\left|\zeta(s+ikh,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})-p_2(s)\right|<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right\}.$$

This together with the inequality (20) gives the assertion of the theorem. □

5. The case of modified zeta-functions

In Section 1, we mentioned an incomplete point in [10]. An inaccuracy is actually included in a former paper [11], whose result is applied to [10]. On p. 103 of [11], the same as (10) for $(\underline{k},\underline{l})\neq(\underline{0},\underline{0})$ is claimed under the assumption that α is transcendental and $\exp\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\}$ is rational. The same reasoning as in the case of (10) is valid if there is some $l_m\neq 0$, because from (11) we have

$$\prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}} p^{k_p}\prod_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}(m+\alpha)^{l_m}=\left(\exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\}\right)^a, \quad (21)$$

which contradicts the assumption. But if all $l_m=0$, then (21) does not produce a contradiction. Therefore the results in [11], and hence in [10], is to be amended.

Write $\exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\}=\frac{a}{b}$, $a,b\in\mathbb{Z}$, $(a,b)=1$, and denote by $\mathbb{P}_h$ the set of all primes appearing as prime divisors of a or b. Instead of $Q_N(A)$ defined in Section 2, we define $Q_{N,h}(A)$ by replacing $\mathbb{P}$ in the definition of $Q_N(A)$ by $\mathbb{P}\setminus\mathbb{P}_h$. Let

$$\Omega_{1h}=\prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}\setminus\mathbb{P}_h}\gamma_p,$$

and denote the probability Haar measure on $(\Omega_{1h},\mathcal{B}(\Omega_{1h}))$ by m_{1hH}.

Lemma 11. *Assume that α is transcendental and $\exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\}$ is rational. Then $Q_{N,h}$ converges weakly to the Haar measure $m_{hH}=m_{1hH}\times m_{2H}$ on the space $\Omega_h=\Omega_{1h}\times\Omega_2$ as $N\to\infty$.*

Proof. If we replace $\mathbb{P}$ by $\mathbb{P}\setminus\mathbb{P}_h$ in (21), then the resulting equality is impossible even if all $l_m=0$. Therefore (10) is valid for any $(\underline{k},\underline{l})\neq(\underline{0},\underline{0})$, and so we can mimic the proof of Lemma 5. □

This lemma is the corrected version of Lemma 2.1 of [11]. Let χ be a Dirichlet character, and define a modified Dirichlet L-function by

$$L_h(s,\chi)=\prod_{p\in\mathbb{P}\setminus\mathbb{P}_h}\left(1-\frac{\chi(p)}{p^s}\right)^{-1}.$$

Then, using Lemma 11, we can show a mixed joint discrete universality theorem for $L_h(s,\chi)$ and a periodic Hurwitz zeta-function, by the argument in [10]. This is the corrected version of Theorem 1.7 of [10], which was already mentioned in [19].

It is possible to generalize the above arguments to the class of Matsumoto zeta-functions. We conclude the present paper with the statement of such results.

Define the modified Matsumoto zeta-function by

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_h(s)=\prod_{m\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\mathbb{N}_h}\prod_{j=1}^{g(m)}\left(1-a_m^{(j)}p_m^{-sf(j,m)}\right)^{-1}, \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbb{N}_h$ is the set of all $m\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $p_m\in\mathbb{P}_h$, and $\varphi_h(s)=\widetilde{\varphi}_h(s+\alpha+\beta)$. The difference between $\varphi_h(s)$ and $\varphi(s)$ is only finitely many Euler factors, so their analytic properties are not so different. In particular, if $\varphi(s)$ satisfies the properties (a), (b) and (c), then so is $\varphi_h(s)$, too. Therefore, the method developed in the previous sections of the present paper can be applied to $\varphi_h(s)$. Let

$$\underline{Z}_h(\underline{s})=(\varphi_h(s_1),\zeta(s_2,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})),$$
$$\underline{Z}_h(\underline{s},\omega_h)=(\varphi_h(s_1,\omega_{1h}),\zeta(s_2,\alpha,\omega_2;\mathfrak{B})),$$

where $\omega_h=(\omega_{1h},\omega_2)\in\Omega_h$. Define $P_{\underline{Z},h}$ and $P_{N,h}$ analogously to $P_{\underline{Z}}$ and P_N, just replacing $\underline{Z}(\underline{s},\omega)$ and $\underline{Z}(\underline{s}+ikh)$ by $\underline{Z}_h(\underline{s},\omega_h)$ and $\underline{Z}_h(\underline{s}+ikh)$, respectively. Then, using Lemma 11, we obtain

Theorem 12. *Suppose that α is transcendental and $\exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\}$ is rational. Then $P_{N,h}$ converges weakly to $P_{\underline{Z},h}$ as $N\to\infty$.*

Theorem 13. *Let $\varphi(s)\in\widetilde{S}$, K_1, K_2, $f_1(s)$ and $f_2(s)$ satisfy the conditions as in Theorem 2. Suppose that α is transcendental and $\exp\left\{\frac{2\pi}{h}\right\}$ is rational. Then, for every $\varepsilon>0$,*

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N+1}\#\left\{0\le k\le N:\ \sup_{s\in K_1}|\varphi_h(s+ikh)-f_1(s)|<\varepsilon,\ \sup_{s\in K_2}|\zeta(s+ikh,\alpha;\mathfrak{B})-f_2(s)|<\varepsilon\right\}>0.$$

REFERENCES

[1] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of Probability Maeasures*, Willey, New York, 1968.

[2] K.M. Bitar, N.N. Khuri, H.C. Ren, Path integrals and Voronin's theorem on the universality of the Riemann zeta function, *Ann. Phys.*, **211**, No. 1, 172–196 (1991).

[3] E. Buivydas, A. Laurinčikas, A discrete version of the Mishou theorem, *Ramanujan J.*, **38**, No. 2, 331–347 (2015).

[4] E. Buivydas, A. Laurinčikas, A generalized joint discrete universality theorem for the Riemann and Hurwitz zeta-functions, *Lith. Math. J.*, **55**, No. 2, 193–206 (2015).

[5] J.B. Conway, *Functions of One Variable I*, Springer Verlag, New York, 1978.

[6] H. Cramér, M. Leadbetter, *Stationary and Related Stochastic Processes*, Wiley, New York, 1967.

[7] H. Heyer, *Probability Measures on Locally Compact Groups*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.

[8] A. Javtokas, A. Laurinčikas, On the periodic Hurwitz zeta-function, *Hardy-Ramanujan J.*, **29**, 18–36 (2006).

[9] R. Kačinskaitė, A discrete universality theorem for the Matsumoto zeta-function, *Liet. Mat. Rink.*, **42**, Spec. Issue, 55–58 (2002).

[10] R. Kačinskaitė, Joint discrete universality of periodic zeta-functions, *Integr. Transf. Spec. Funct.*, **22**, 593–601 (2011).

[11] R. Kačinskaitė, D. Korsakienė, Joint discrete value distribution of the periodic zeta-functions, in *New Directions in Value-Distribution Theory of Zeta and L-Functions*, R.& J. Steuding (eds.), Shaker, Aachen, 2009, pp. 99–111.

[12] R. Kačinskaitė, K. Matsumoto, The mixed joint universality for a class of zeta-functions, *Math. Nachr.*, **288**, No. 16, 1900–1909 (2015).

[13] R. Kačinskaitė, K. Matsumoto, Remarks on the mixed joint universality for a class of zeta-functions, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.*, (to appear).

[14] J.L. Kelley, *General Topology*, Van Nostrand, New Jersey, 1955.

[15] A. Laurinčikas, *Limit Theorems for the Riemann Zeta-Function*, Kluwer Academic Publisher, Dordrecht etc., 1996.

[16] A. Laurinčikas, On limit distribution of the Matsumoto zeta-function II, *Liet. Mat. Rink.*, **36**, 464–485 (1996) (in Russian) = *Lith. Math. J.*, **36**, 371–387 (1996).

[17] A. Laurinčikas, R. Macaitienė, The discrete universality of the periodic Hurwitz zeta function, *Integr. Transf. Spec. Funct.*, **20**, 673–686 (2009).

[18] K. Matsumoto, Value-distribution of zeta-functions, in *Analytic Number Theory*, Proc. Japanese-French Sympos. held in Tokyo, K. Nagasaka and E. Fouvry (eds.), Lecture Notes Math., **1434**, Springer Verlag, Berlin etc., 1990, pp. 178–187.

[19] K. Matsumoto, A survey on the theory of universality for zeta and L-functions, in *Number Theory: Plowing and Starring through High Wave Forms*, M. Kaneko et al. (eds.), World Scientific, Singapore, 2015, pp. 95–144.

[20] S.N. Mergelyan, Uniform approximations to functions of a complex variable, *Usp. Mat. Nauk, Ser. 7*, **2**, 31–122 (1952) (in Russian) = *Am. Math. Soc. Transl.*, **101**, 99 p. (1954).

[21] H. Mishou, The joint value distribution of the Riemann zeta function and Hurwitz zeta-functions, *Lith. Math. J.*, **47**, 32–47 (2007).

[22] H.L. Montgomery, *Topics in Multiplicative Number Theory*, Lecture Notes in Math. **227**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin etc., 1971.

[23] J. Sander, J. Steuding, Joint universality for sums and products of Dirichlet L-functions, *Analysis*, **26**, 295–312 (2006).

[24] J. Steuding, *Value-Distribution of L-Functions*, Lecture Notes Math., **1877**, Springer Verlag, Berlin etc., 2007.

R. KAČINSKAITĖ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY, KAUNAS, VILEIKOS 8, LT-44404, LITHUANIA, DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATICS AND MATHEMATICS, ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY, VILNIAUS 141, LT-76353 ŠIAULIAI, LITHUANIA

E-mail address: r.kacinskaite@if.vdu.lt, r.kacinskaite@fm.su.lt

K. MATSUMOTO, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, CHIKUSA-KU, NAGOYA 464-8602, JAPAN

E-mail address: kohjimat@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp